ED160555

Faculty Development:

The "Haves" and the "Have-nots"

by

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bartholomew J. Ciampa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bartholomew J. Ciampa, Ph.D.
Director of Graduate Studies and
Special Academic Programs
Wayne State College
Wayne, Nebraska

SP013 037

Introduction

Comedian Steve Martin, in one of his recent television appearances, stated that he had advice that could guarantee that anyone could be a successful millionaire. "First, he said, "get a million dollars. . . . "

Many involved in faculty development believe that the academic parallel to Martin's quip might be: "To guarantee a successful faculty development program; first, get a million dollars. . ."

Most readers, (especially those who are operating existing programs on modest budgets) would be satisfied with substantially less than a million dollars. However, those of us who have had the good fortune to have "substantial" budgets (if any budget every really is substantial) would agree that an equally important consideration is the utilization of available resources toward the professional development of one's faculty.

I'm convinced that a successful faculty development program is more a matter of 'what one does with what he's got' rather than simply 'what he's got'.

It is possible to accomplish a great deal with scant resources and likewise, it is possible for a well-funded program to accomplish little in terms of "real" faculty development versus "apparent" faculty development.

I. SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO CONSIDER

For those who operate faculty development programs on modest budgets think about this:

Q. What would you do if, unexpectedly, you received a grant of, say $30,000 specifically earmarked for faculty development?

A_1. I'd purchase software materials for our faculty development library. But,

who would use the materials? . . .

A_2. I'd set aside funds to release faculty members from a portion of their teaching duties to pursue independent research. But, who would be released? . . .

A_3. I'd offer outright grants to faculty members to pursue classroom-related, instructional improvement projects. But, who would apply for funding? . . .

A_4. I'd earmark funds for professional travel to conferences and workshops. But, which faculty members, which conferences, with what results? . . .

A_5. I'd earmark funds for the use of a faculty evaluation instrument (like IDEA, TABS, SIR, or ISIS) to foster professional growth. But, who would use it; how would it be "posed" (or "imposed", as the case may be)? . . .

Many faculty development specialists assume that faculties want to be developed. "All our program needs is a few bucks dropped on it and faculty members will be beating the doors down, shouting 'develop me, develop me!'" seems to be the attitude of many; especially those who feel under-funded.

The biggest problem as I see it, however, is in the area of faculty receptivity toward developmental activities. For, as implied in the preceding question/answer section, successful faculty development programs are voluntary faculty development programs.

Of course there are those individuals who would love to have a few dollars to cover postage for that certain questionnaire, or for incidental supplies, or for xeroxing journal articles, but, how can one help his faculty-at-large become sensitive to the importance of continually improving and refining professional skills?

How can the faculty itself become actively involved in encouraging the submission of proposals and in administering funds for research projects?

How can faculty evaluation procedures (for professional growth - not for

promotion or tenure) be made non-threatening?

Successful faculty development programs don't just "happen". They are usually the result of intense behind-the-scenes orchestration by a faculty development coordinator in concert with the college's administration on the one hand, and the faculty on the other.

The Faculty Development Coordinator

How the faculty development coordinator is perceived by both the faculty and administration is of crucial significance.

He/she should be an effective teacher and competent scholar. (It helps if this person has "proven" him/herself as a faculty member of long standing at the institution and is perceived to have the best interests of the faculty as the highest priority.) He/she should be a tenured associate or full professor who achieved his/her professional status through on-going and readily apparent professional development. He/she should be provided with a reduced workload (teaching and/or committee assignment) so that at least 50 percent of his/her time can be devoted to development activities.

He/she should be perceived by the faculty as a non-threatening person with no "ax to grind". He/she should have demonstrated a prior commitment to faculty development to the extent that he/she has been helping other faculty members on a collegial basis before agreeing to assume a formal development role. He/she should be perceived by the administration as being candid, able to accomplish goals with minimal administrative direction or intervention, and someone who holds the best interests of the institution at heart.

He/she must believe in the value of a program for the on-going evaluation of classroom performance. He/she must be willing to administer evaluation instruments and provide qualitative feedback to colleagues. (It must be noted that the professional development evaluation results must remain confidential

in order to maintain a high level of credibility and resultant high participation levels. It should be well-publicized that the administration, by its own choosing, does not wish to know the results of these evaluations in order to decrease the likelihood of a stigma or punitive aura surrounding the evaluation procedure. In addition, the administration must be willing to "set the stage" by providing whatever support possible while, within reason, maintaining a "hands-off" posture.)

Although the foregoing characteristics of a faculty development coordinator might appear to be held only by those who are eligible for canonization, nearly every campus has someone extant who approaches this description. Think about it.

II. THE "HAVES": WHAT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS CAN BUY

Faculties come in all sizes, pre-dispositions, temperaments, preparation levels, areas of specialization, etc. With this in mind it is obvious that any generalizations offered are vulnerable to criticism. However, in the face of this possibility I would like to proffer a number of funding levels together with concommitant suggestions for the utilization of those faculty development funds.

A $30,000 Faculty Development Program:

Myriad combinations of the following areas and amounts exist. The amounts devoted to each area, of necessity, should be mandated by the needs of the particular faculty in question.

1) Released Time: Ten faculty released from one course each (perhaps five per semester) to pursue individual research in their fields. Part-time faculty can be contracted to teach those ten courses at an average salary of $1500 per course. It's quite possible to obtain competent part- = $15,000

time instructors at substantially lower rates thus releasing more faculty.

2) Minigrant Awards: Ten faculty members could be awarded grants averaging $500 each. This money could be used to pay for clerical assistance, materials, and other project support to improve instructional effectiveness. Proposal forms and screening procedures could be the responsibility of a faculty committee with elected representatives from each academic division or unit. = $ 5,000

3) Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation: This amount would be used for the purchase of evaluation forms and computer analysis services for 200 faculty members to be evaluated twice during the academic year through IDEA (Kansas State University), for example. (Obviously, 400 faculty evaluations per year or 800 faculty evaluations every other year are possible and could be determined according to faculty levels of volunteerism.) = $ 2,000

4) Professional Development Library Materials: A professional development library with tapes, books, periodical subscriptions, teaching improvement kits in various areas, etc. could be made available to faculty members. This material could be housed in a special (and comfortable!) area of the existing library so that faculty members, during regular library visits, would be encouraged to browse. = $ 1,000

5) Professional Retreats: Forty faculty members (@ $100) could attend a professional "retreat" or off-campus divisional "brainstorming" workshop. For example, a ten- = $ 4,000

member academic department could have $1,000 to pay for food, lodging, transportation, and perhaps a guest speaker, at a nearby off-campus site, for three days and two nights during a time period of the department members' choosing. This time could be spent making curricular plans, conducting awareness sessions, clarifying or modifying the departmental "mission", or numerous other undertakings. The geographical separation of faculty members from the campus can foster an informality and openness very conducive to qualitative introspection.

6) Professional Travel: This amount can be used to defray the expenses of eight faculty members to travel to professional conferences and workshops at an average cost of $250 for transportation, food, and lodging. Again, a faculty committee can assume responsibility for the selection procedure. = $ 2,000

7) Consultant Services: Between $500 and $1000 could be earmarked for a once-per-year visit by a faculty development specialist who could spend two-to-three days evaluating the previous years' activities and assisting in planning for the subsequent year. Remaining funds could be used for incidental expenses, expendable supplies, postage, etc. = $ 1,000

TOTAL $30,000

A $20,000 Faculty Development Program:

Each institution, through the on-going efforts of all engaged either directly or indirectly in faculty development must make decisions regarding

the appropriate allocation of funds. The following recommendations were made arbitrarily. It is understood that institutional uniqueness will result in diverse combinations of areas and funding levels.

1) Released Time: Five faculty members each released from one course. Part-time replacement faculty contracted at the rate of $1500 per course. Again, the amount per course may fluctuate based upon the number of course-credit-hours, the availability of competent replacements, etc. = $7,500

2) Minigrant Awards: Twelve faculty members could be awarded grants averaging $500 each. = $6,000

3) Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation: This amount will support the evaluation of one hundred faculty members per semester. Depending upon the size of the faculty to be evaluated, these evaluations can be conducted on a semester-by-semester, once per year, or alternating year basis. Of course, other options exist concommitant with institutional character. = $1,000

4) Professional Development Library Materials: It is essential that software materials which are likely to be used are purchased for the Professional Development Library. If, as suggested earlier, existing library space is not available for this purpose, an area in the Faculty Lounge (or, Student Center, for that matter) can be used. High traffic areas are most likely to produce successful results regarding materials use. = $ 500

5) Professional Retreats: Twenty faculty members (@ $100) can be sponsored to attend retreats or workshops away = $2,000

from campus.

6) Professional Travel: Eight faculty members at an average cost of $250 each can be sent to professional conferences or workshops to improve instructional effectiveness. = $2,000

7) Consultant Services: This amount can be earmarked for travel, lodging, and a modest honorarium ($100 per day) in support of a consultative visit. Remaining funds can be used to support incidental expenses, postage, supplies, etc. = $1,000

TOTAL = $20,000

A $10,000 Faculty Development Program:

1) Released Time: Three faculty members released from one course each at a replacement cost of $1500 per course. = $4,500

2) Minigrant Awards: Ten faculty projects can be supported at an average of $200 per grant. = $2,000

3) Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation: This amount can be used for the purchase of evaluation forms and computer analysis services for 50 faculty members to be evaluated each semester, 100 per year, or 200 per alternating year, etc. = $ 500

4) Professional Development Library Materials: = $ 500

5) Professional Retreats: Ten faculty (@ $100) can be sponsored. = $1,000

6) Professional Travel: This amount can enable four faculty members, at an average cost of $250 each, to attend professional conferences or workshops to improve instructional effectiveness. = $1,000

7) Consultant Services: Financial constraints now limit travel expenses and accommodations to $300 and the honorarium to $100 per day for two days. = $ 500

TOTAL = $10,000

A $5,000 Faculty Development Program:

1) Released Time: Financially supported released time activities now become difficult to defend. However, the same benefits can be achieved by utilizing team teaching techniques, courses being "covered" by other members of the same department as an overload, or offering a particular course on an alternating semester basis. Faculty collegiality level is the crucial factor in these cases. (It is often the case that faculty members most likely to be cooperative under these circumstances are the least needy of developmental activities.) = $ 0

2) Minigrant Awards: The maintenance of high morale becomes an important factor here. Ten faculty members can be awarded an average of $150 per grant for instructional improvement projects. = $1,500

3) Teaching Effectiveness Evaluation: = $ 500

4) Professional Development Library Materials: = $ 500

5) Professional Retreats: = $1,000

6) Professional Travel: = $1,000

7) Consultant Services: = $ 500

TOTAL = $5,000

III. THE "HAVE-NOTS": Faculty Development on a (nearly) Zero-based Budget

Institutions with little or no money earmarked for faculty development activities cannot use this lack of funding as an excuse for neglecting this important area. In times of impending declines in the college-age population, faculty retrenchment, financial exigency by way of taxpayer "revolts" and legislative mandates, student demands for an increased voice in academic governance, etc., effective faculty development activities in many instances may be directly linked to the very survival of an institution or, at the very least, to enhancing its credibility to its various publics.

The crux of the issue is: What activities toward improving the professional development of the faculty can be accomplished when minimal financial resources are available?

The following represents a partial listing (not in order of priority) of activities which can be undertaken on nearly every campus. It is meant to provide a springboard toward viewing faculty development possibilities from a creative perspective in view of the prevailing constraints at each particular institution.

Faculty Development Coordinator: As stated earlier, this person may be a present member of the institution's faculty. If possible, a portion of this person's workload can be distributed over other members of his/her department, offered on an alternate semester or year basis, decreased through retrenchment, etc. It is also possible that a faculty member who is about to retire might consider maintaining a half time faculty development position subsequent to retirement. At the very least, a faculty member who is sensitive to the importance of faculty development could be named chairman of a Professional Development Committee in lieu of another committee assignment.

Professional Development Committee: This committee can be constituted by electing (or selecting) one representative per academic division (or department, depending on institutional size). It should provide a broad faculty base for: the development of teacher-effectiveness evaluation instruments and procedures, liaison between the faculty-at-large and administration, determination of appropriate development activities, establishing procedures to solicit external funding, and, where funding exists, establishing procedures for the screening of applicants for mini-grants, etc. The perception of this committee by the faculty-at-large is of crucial importance. If this committee is perceived as an authority-vested body, it will fail in its mission. If its members become involved in "turf protecting" and campus politics, it will fail. If its members are not held in high regard by the faculty, it will fail. If its members will not take a leadership role in their own professional development, it will fail.

Teaming, Sharing, and Covering Classes: It is not uncommon for members of a particular department to assume an overload to make it possible for a colleague to undertake a sabbatical leave. The same concept may be applied to faculty development activities. However, while the time-frame of the sabbatical leave is usually one semester or one academic year, the time-frame for faculty development activities may be somewhat more flexible. For example, the department members may choose to cover each other's courses on a rotating basis for, say, a two-week or one-month period while the particular faculty member pursues a "professional development leave". During this time he/she may be preparing materials which may be of ultimate benefit to the entire department. As stated earlier, the success of this approach is directly proportional to the level of collegiality in the department.

Team-teaching is not a new concept by any means and has been shown to be a very effective device toward improving professional expertise. Faculty members

who have been teaching in relative isolation will benefit greatly by teaming with another faculty member by observing and being observed by a trusted and respected colleague. In addition, academic expertise as well as teaching/communication skills are likely to improve. Most important, is the "fringe benefit" of enhancing one's self-concept through professional improvement. It is possible that one successful (and highly visible) department can "infect" an entire campus with the desire to team-teach for professional development.

Professional Development Library Materials: At most institutions, library funds are allocated by academic department or division. If this is the case, each department may choose to divert a small portion of its library budget to purchase professional development materials for its own (if not campus-wide) use. If the particular institution operates with a campus-wide budget, a small portion of this budget, through administrative intervention, can be appropriated to purchase development materials. If, as in extreme cases, the institution is operating on a zero-based library acquisitions budget, help can be solicited from nearby colleges for back issues or duplicates of professional periodicals, provisions can be made for a "visiting" library of inter-library loan materials available for faculty use.

A Professional Development "Center": Nearly every college has space available for conversion to a professional development "center". It may take the form of an unoccupied faculty office, a small area in a faculty lounge, a cordoned-off section of the library, etc. In short, a little creativity and a few interested faculty members can make such a "center" a valuable meeting place (and a comfortable retreat) for the exchange of ideas toward the ultimate improvement of instructional techniques.

A Teaching-Effectiveness Evaluation Procedure: The Professional Development Committee can assume responsibility for designing an evaluation instrument to be used voluntarily by faculty members. On extremely sensitive campuses, it can be administered and evaluated by the particular faculty member. (It has been shown, however, that students are more likely to give candid responses when such instruments are administered by neutral parties.) If possible, student input may be solicited in the development of the instrument. This will help to improve the faculty's credibility with the student body. If students are aware of the faculty's efforts toward self-improvement they are likely to be more receptive in the classroom, thus affecting instructional effectiveness.

In-House Workshops: On many campuses faculty talents remain untapped. The Coordinator or members of the Professional Development Committee should become attuned to the skills of individual faculty members for possible utilization in conducting in-service workshops. Special expertise in audio-visual materials construction, cognitive styles of learning, interpersonal communications, fund raising/proposal writing, etc., are some examples. In general, dynamic classroom teachers (everyone knows who these people are!) are likely to be successful workshop coordinators. A note of caution: In-service workshops should be made as appealing as possible. The time-frame, place and personnel involved should be matters that are being constantly considered.

Lecture Series, Speakers Bureau: One evening each month throughout the academic year, for example, interested faculty volunteers could arrange to conduct a seminar open to students, faculty, and staff, on a timely and interesting topic related to their fields. If the appropriate person (people) put out the "call" for possible volunteers the results may be surprising. Attendance may be low at first but word will travel and, reinforced by campus advertising through

bulletins, flyers, campus mail, campus radio or T.V., etc., people will gradually begin to attend these seminars. The person presenting the lecture/seminar will probably gain as much in terms of improving his instructional effectiveness as his audience gains regarding the content of the presentation. Again, success in this area with a few highly visible and respected faculty members will be contagious.

A Speakers Bureau can be formed with the assistance of the Professional Development Committee. Forms can be designed and sent to the faculty for response regarding their willingness to be available to speak to civic groups, luncheon groups, business groups, commencement audiences, etc., on topics of interest (e.g., the social impact of recent research in a particular field, sabbatical or professional travel, personal expertise in a tangential area). An obvious fringe benefit is the goodwill generated by the faculty outside of the college community. This, in turn, may be parleyed into modest funding for the Faculty Development Program.

Faculty Activity Bulletin Board: A bulletin board strategically placed in a high-traffic area displaying faculty development activities, recent accomplishments of faculty members, grant information, pamphlets, etc., can be used effectively as a tool to enhance the visibility of development activities. The campus mail-room is a good candidate in this regard since most faculty pass through this area daily.

Faculty/Student Symposia or Colloquia: Differing from the previously stated Lecture Series, this enables faculty groups to work with student groups. Discussions may be thematic and may be intra-or-inter-departmental, formal or informal in nature. Again, a faculty member's preparations for presentations should prove to result in professional enrichment.

Sabbatical-Leave Policy: Most institutions have a sabbatical-leave policy. The adminstration may wish to route sabbatical-leave proposals through the Professional Development Committee for recommendations. As this procedure becomes more widely known, sabbatical-leave proposals will become more and more professional development oriented. The possibility also exists for allocating a one-semester sabbatical-leave for a faculty member to initiate a faculty development program at the institution in question.

Guest (Friends) from other Institutions: Many faculty members have friends who are employed by nearby institutions and who have expertise that may be utilized in a faculty development program. Often, a new face and fresh approach (often for gratis!) can prove to be very stimulating.

Alumni Questionnaire: For a modest amount of postage (maybe out of the Alumni Office budget) a questionnaire can be sent to recent graduates soliciting feedback which might stimulate faculty development activities. A few questions of the nature: "What professional activities can our faculty members pursue which would directly improve their teaching? might serve to provide some "hard" evidence as to the importance of constant self-renewal. Also, alumni involvement may prove to be very rewarding in financial terms. The Professional Development Committee can help in the design of the instrument.

Conclusion

Successful program development is a long and sometimes arduous process. However, it is not unrealistic to expect some positive results after a short period of time. The "right" coordinator for the job coupled with the "right" professional development committee under the "right" conditions can turn an institution's faculty around. Capitalizing upon the present strengths of the faculty and the institution while acknowledging (through not being over-zealous)

existing weaknesses, being an untiring worker for the "cause", displaying a personal commitment to constant self-improvement, being willing to solicit ideas and to listen to people, being sensitive to the inherent fear of evaluation on the parts of some, being able to live with slow progress, being able to "turn people on", are some of the qualities the successful faculty development coordinator should possess. Setting the stage for developmental activities is the key to success.

The program must be made so appealing that faculty members actually want to participate, if only for the accompanying prestige. For this reason programs should not be perceived as being mundane, wastes of time, or "high-schoolish". For, faculty development activities should make sense to even the most recalcitrant faculty members. And, to initiate sensible programs, high funding levels are not really necessary. What are necessary, however, are high levels of personal commitment.